

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box (430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.opto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/578,000	05/03/2006	Shizuo Manabe	HIR-0037	5200	
23353 RADER FISH	7590 08/18/2009 MAN & GRAUER PLLC	EXAM	EXAMINER		
LION BUILDI	ING REET N.W., SUITE 501		WANG, JIN CHENG		
WASHINGTO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	-,		2628		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/18/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/578,000	MANABE, SHIZUO				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	JIN-CHENG WANG	2628				

	JIN-CHENG WANG	2628	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07.  Extensions of time may be oblained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of eventuer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the self or this (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount thortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic e of the final rejection, e	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as ven if timely filed,
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to a large the proposed amendment of the file after a final rejection, to a large the proposed amendment of the proposed amendment</li></ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See below</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33)		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	
7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 4-10.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See below.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
	/Jin-Cheng Wang/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2628	

## Continuation of Item 3(a):

The amendment after final does not place the application in condition for allowance because the amended claim does not overcome the rationale of rejection set for in the Final Rejection dated 34/2009. For example, the new amendment limit claim to computer readable storage medium, However, limiting the claim to computer readable storage medium does not add any practical limitation to the scope of the claim. Such a field-of-use limitation is insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible claim patent eligible in essence applicant is preempting all substantial uses of the claimed abstract idea. See In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008), In re Abele and Marshall, 214 USPO 682 (C.C.P.A. 1982). US Patent and Trademark Office Appeal No. 2008-1495, Ex parte Lars Langemyr et al., decided May 28, 2008. Additionally the storage medium limitation does not make the non-statutory method statutory in view of Patent and Trademark Office Appeal No. 2008-1495, Ex parte Lars Langemyr et al., decided May 28, 2008. US Patent and Trademark Office Appeal No. 2008-1495, Ex parte Lars Langemyr et al., decided May 28, 2008. US Patent and Trademark Office Appeal No. 2008-1495.

## Continuation of Item 11:

Applicant argues in essence with respect to the claim 1 and similar claims that Kobari fails to disclose a placement to place a character string along a prospective guide line that is located at the center of prospective guide lines that are longer than the longest horizontal segment of the area of the character string. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Kobari teaches that each circumscribed quadrangle has two horizontal prospective guide lines.

Kobari teaches at Drawing #3 that at least two horizontal prospective guide lines for each circumscribed quadrangle 6 and at least two horizontal prospective guide lines for each circumscribed quadrangle 5 along with a centerline of the quadrangles or the horizontal line are drawn in the figure, meeting the claimed prospective

guide line(s). Kobari teaches at at Drawing# 5 and Paragraph 0017 that the actual breadth of the character string

circumscribed quadrangle 6 in the middle point of the lengthwise direction of the circumscribed quadrangle 5 of a polygon should have more than a character string width + threshold, thus the two horizontal guide lines of the quadrangle are longer than the character string, meeting the claimed "longer than the longest horizontal segment of the area of the character string, meeting the claimed "longer than the longest horizontal segment of the area of the character string."